



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

2. We would ask the pastors and members of our churches to watch closely the action of the Congress of the United States, and whenever measures are introduced looking toward international good-will, or *vice versa*, that they would write personal letters to the Senators and Congressmen from their State and district, urging that they vote from the Christian point of view. Such letters have great weight.

3. We believe that the time has come when civilization must make choice between two ways for the future: the way of statesmanship or the way of battleship, the old way of settling disputes by force or the new way of settling them by justice. So far we have lived by the old way almost exclusively. There are many who are now clamoring that we persist forever in that way. "Arm," they say, for there is no other way. In our time a great throng of noble men, prophets, statesmen, teachers, poets, yes, business men and men of all callings, have seen the vision of the new way—the way of the Lord, the way of brotherhood, justice, and good-will. They are demanding that we choose international tribunals, arbitration treaties, and such judicial methods as Christian men practice among themselves. The choice must be made soon and once for all, or militarism will gain the day. We call upon the Christian men and women of the nation to rise at this time and demand that all nations learn again the first principles of the teachings of Jesus Christ, that membership in his kingdom should so bind them together in mutual love and mutual antagonism to the common foes of God and man that the thought of engaging with each other in deadly combat shall become abhorrent and impossible forever.

### A Joint Anglo-German Manifesto in Favor of Peace.

The following manifesto, as reported by *The Arbitrator*, has been signed by the 110 Social Democratic members of the German Reichstag and 41 Labor members of the House of Commons:

The Parliaments of both Germany and England have again decided to grant the naval demands of their governments and enormously increase the burden of armaments. The representatives of the working classes of both countries—the members of the Social Democratic party in Germany and the Labor party in England—have fought against this increase and voted against it. But they are not strong enough in their Parliaments to prevent the acceptance of the military and naval budgets. Consequently the competition in armaments continues its fateful and fatal course, putting on the shoulders of the people at a time of a general rise in prices for all commodities a new and heavy burden and at the same time aggravating the danger of a dreadful war.

The workmen of Germany do not entertain any hostile feelings for England, nor do English workmen for Germany. Most determinedly they stand against all those who incite to war in both countries. They do not demand an increase in the capitalistic competition in armaments, but its abolition; not an incitement to war, but a mutual understanding between both nations.

A war between England and Germany would lead to

such a catastrophe as history has never yet seen. All those who cause such a danger commit an infamous crime on humanity. The possibility of preventing this catastrophe lies in the hands of the working classes of both our countries. We, as representatives of the organized, class-conscious workmen in both countries, therefore urge the whole body of workmen both in Germany and Great Britain to join our organizations to prevent civilization and culture being pulled down into the abyss and numberless human lives annihilated.

Workmen of England and Germany! Wherever you meet you must always remember that you have an historical part to play and the general welfare of the nations to advance. Agitate and organize for the mutual understanding of peoples and for peace.

### Peace Bureau's Appeal to the Powers.

The International Peace Bureau at Berne, Switzerland, issued on the 25th of October the following appeal to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the different countries:

MR. MINISTER: We had supposed that the efforts of the world's diplomacy would be sufficiently powerful to impose upon the states interested a pacific solution of the age-long conflict which at the present moment is drenching with blood the Balkan Peninsula, and we were waiting for the hour at which we should be able to felicitate the governments on the attitude taken and the success secured by them.

Once more the peoples are witnessing the lamentable spectacle of powers armed to the teeth, at the price of yearly sacrifices which exceed twelve billions of francs, incapable of maintaining peace in the world, at the same time that Emperors, Kings, and Ministers never cease to repeat that these monstrous sacrifices are necessary in order to assure the maintenance of peace. Is your government, whose international relations have been entrusted to you, going to continue, by criminal inaction, to assume the heavy responsibility falling upon it in the war which is going on at the present time? Is it going to assume the terrible responsibility of the catastrophe with which we are menaced, and which, if it should come, would be the suicide of Europe?

We shall receive the answer that diplomacy is active; that notes are being exchanged while people are killing each other. When men fight in the street it is not customary for the authorities who are charged with preserving the public peace to write letters and deliberate. They begin by putting an end to the fight. That is what we ask you to do in the Orient.

The masses of the people who desire to live in peace are expecting from the governments an energetic attitude. They invite these governments to act without delay and without weakness. We join our voice to theirs. It must not be allowed to be said that the powers intervene only when it is a question of defending the interests of holders of bonds and of rapacious politicians. It is useless to offer them that. What the peoples ask for in a limited form now they will demand tomorrow. Already the popular will has been strengthened by recent events. Interpolations will be

made forthwith in different Parliaments. We venture to hope that precise and acceptable answers will be given, and that refuge will not be taken behind vain formulas of secret diplomacy. It is not with their own affairs and the affairs of their friends that the diplomats have to deal. Their mission is to see that there is good understanding and concord among peoples. At the very least, the peoples ought to be informed of the destiny which is being prepared for them. Secret diplomacy is an institution belonging to an epoch in which people were bought and sold like sheep. This epoch is past.

We take the liberty of recalling to your attention the principles, long since proclaimed, which would make it possible to solve the Balkan conflict without the shedding of blood and to the satisfaction of all:

Relations between the nations are to be regulated by the same principles of right and morality as those which determine the relations between individuals.

No nation has the right to be judge in its own cause.

No nation has the right to declare war against another.

The autonomy of every nation is inviolable.

Nations have the inalienable and imprescriptible right to dispose freely of themselves.

The duty of securing respect for these principles devolves upon the Society of Nations, which has the right to enforce the observance of them upon individual nations which may attempt to violate them. The Society of Nations possesses for this purpose the necessary authority and force.

Unfortunately unavowed rivalries obscure the clear vision of what is the imperative duty of the nations which pretend to be civilized. Each one of them, or a number of them, aspires to a leadership which is unjustifiable and desires to reserve for itself alone the exploitation of certain regions, instead of opening all these quarters of the globe to the activity of all.

To this folly of conquest and domination we oppose a policy of wisdom and good sense.

To make of the European Orient a federation of free peoples devoted to industry and to commerce; to raise Constantinople to the dignity of a world metropolis and a vast center, whither the men of all races of Europe, Asia, and Africa will come and fraternize; to provoke by railroads, constructed with the collaboration of capital from all sections of the world, the awakening of the Asiatic countries which have been asleep for centuries, and to open up between Persia, India, and China a great international highway—such is the great work which is worthy of a humanity truly human, toward which all the forces of governments sincerely desirous of the peace of the world should tend.

To this work of life and co-operation we invite your Government to give its disinterested support.

With assurances of our greatest respect we are, for the International Peace Bureau,

Sincerely yours,

H. LA FONTAINE, *President*.

A. GOBAT, *Director*.

## More Soldiers or More Reason?

By Edwin D. Mead.

Discussions of national defense by "chiefs of staff" are usually unedifying and almost always superfluous. They are superfluous because we always know in advance what these gentlemen will say. They are the last people in the world for reasonable republics to listen to for advice about the size of their armies and navies. Men might as well ask their tailor whether they should have a new coat or their architect for his opinion whether a bigger and costlier house is in order. Since time began there was no head of a country's military establishment who did not call for more soldiers and military machinery. The German army today is not big enough to suit "the staff," and the British navy is not big enough to suit the admiralty. Our own army is not big enough to suit Gen. Leonard Wood, its chief of staff. We could mobilize only 105,000 men, and for the war which we shall "probably have in the not distant future" we must have 600,000. Therefore young college men especially should get busy, so that when the war comes they can be the officers.

This was actually preached recently by Gen. Leonard Wood at the Harvard Union to an audience, we read, of 500 Harvard students. It was certainly not so bad as his last public preachment. That was at St. Louis, where he went into his glowing panegyric upon the universal military service in Germany, and wished that we might out-German Germany in this sort of thing. But the Harvard preachment was certainly bad enough, and many serious men cannot fail to ask themselves, as they read the report, whether it is not perilously close to an impropriety for "chiefs of staff" and other such executive agents in the Government's military service to take the platform for discussions of public policy involving military issues. The peril lies in the fact that while these gentlemen are supposedly experts on questions of how to fight, they are as such the last persons in the world to go to for counsel as to whether to fight or to get into the fighting attitude, while the uncritical and superficial crowd is constantly apt to think them experts in the larger question, which is a question of statesmanship. The most foolish thing ever said by Fighting Bob Evans, was at a time when Congress was discussing the naval appropriations, that what the country needed was "fewer statesmen and more battleships." His slur was upon the statesmen; but he is to be thanked, at least, for pointing a good antithesis and reminding us that the two stand in opposition, and that the more we have of one the less we shall have of the other. The question for this republic is at the moment which kind of ship—battleship or statesmanship—it means to make its ship of state.

The worst part of Gen. Leonard Wood's plea before the Harvard students for bigger armaments was the ground upon which he based it. "We are the only nation which stands for definite policies which are almost certain to bring us into conflict with other nations which are expanding. The Monroe Doctrine and our policy of not allowing even commercial coaling stations of other powers in American waters are practically sure to cramp foreign nations at some time" and force us into war with them; hence let us have betimes 600,000 soldiers. Hence, the rational man would surely say,